



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/796,485

03/09/2004

Steven M. Stone

940472.267909

2291

85426

7590

05/19/2009

Moore & Van Allen, PLLC for Lowe's Companies, Inc.

430 Davis Drive, Suite 500

P.O. Box 13706

Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

RUDY, ANDREW J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3687

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/19/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/796,485	<b>Applicant(s)</b> STONE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Andrew Joseph Rudy	<b>Art Unit</b> 3687	

  

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Andrew Joseph Rudy. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) W. Kevin Ransom (Reg. No. 45,031). (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 18 May 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic    b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant    2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes    e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 2-6 and 8.

Identification of prior art discussed: Pieper et al., US 7,099,734.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached.    g) ☒ was not reached.    h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Final rejection was indeed a Final rejection in spite of Final Office Action inadvertently not including the proper form paragraph indicating such. Applicant noted prior art, e. g. Pieper, did not meet claim limitations. Examiner noted intended use claim language. Examiner is open to Applicant going towards computer software type claims and cancelling system claims. The issue of a RCE being filed to accomplish such was discussed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Andrew Joseph Rudy/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3687	
---	--